



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/818,228 | 03/27/2001 | Kent L. Christopher | 1246/39(a) | 2216 |

7590 01/31/2002

Thomas S. Birney, Esq.
Dorr, Carson, Sloan & Birney, P.C.
3010 E. 6th Avenue
Denver, CO 80206

EXAMINER

PATEL, MITAL B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3761

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/818,228

Applicant(s)

CHRISTOPHER, KENT L.

Examiner

Mital B. Patel

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment/Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. In response to applicant's argument that 'the present application require that the distal end of the catheter extends 'into the patient's distal nasopharynx or oropharynx,'" a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).
3. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., an open system) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
4. In response to Applicant's arguments with respect to the specifics of the flow rate, the Examiner would like to clarify and reiterate that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a flow rate as recited through experimentation and observation based on the individual and the intended therapy.

Art Unit: 3761

5. In response to Applicant's arguments with respect to trimming the catheter to a desired length, the catheter of Brekke is capable of being trimmed.

6. In response to Applicant's arguments with respect to the method claims, the Examiner maintains the above noted position that the method claim does not specify an open system verses a closed ventilation system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-4, 8, 11-17, 19, 20, 23, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brekke (3915173).

9. As to claim 1, Brekke teaches a nasopharyngeal catheter comprising a nasal catheter **44** having a proximal end and a distal end adapted to extend through a patient's nose and into the patient's distal nasopharynx or oropharynx; a delivery tube **26** connected to the proximal end of the nasal catheter; and a gas source. It should be noted that Brekke fails to specifically teach a delivery tube adapted to extend below the patient's nostril. However, the use of such a delivery tube is well known in the art and modification of Brekke's delivery tube to the recited delivery tube would well be within

Art Unit: 3761

the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, the particulars of the flow rate depend on the individual and intended therapy.

10. As to claim 2, Brekke teaches a nasopharyngeal catheter wherein the nasal catheter comprises a flexible plastic tube that can be cut to a desired length.

11. As to claim 3, the use of a plurality of markings as an indicator is well known in the art.

12. As to claim 4, the use of a radio-opaque strip in a catheter is well known in the art.

13. As to claim 8, the particulars of the dimensions of the catheter can be arrived at through routine observation and experimentation and therefore carry no patentable weight.

14. As to claim 11, the particulars of the back pressure with respect to the gas supplied depends on the intended therapy and also the back pressure can be arrived at through routine observation and experimentation.

15. As to claims 12-14, the particular gases used depends on the intended therapy and therefore carries no patentable weight.

16. As to claim 15, Brekke teaches a nasopharyngeal catheter comprising a nasal catheter **44** having a proximal end and a distal end adapted to extend through a patient's nose and into the patient's distal nasopharynx or oropharynx; the catheter being made of flexible material that can be trimmed to a desired length; a delivery tube **26** connected to the proximal end of the nasal catheter; and a gas source. It should be noted that Brekke fails to specifically teach a delivery tube adapted to extend below the

Art Unit: 3761

patient's nostril. However, the use of such a delivery tube is well known in the art and modification of Brekke's delivery tube to the recited delivery tube would well be within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, the particulars of the flow rate depend on the individual and intended therapy.

17. As to claim 16, the use of a plurality of markings as an indicator is well known in the art.

18. As to claim 17, the use of a radio-opaque strip in a catheter is well known in the art.

19. As to claim 20, the particulars of the dimensions of the catheter can be arrived at through routine observation and experimentation and therefore carry no patentable weight.

20. As to claim 23, Brekke teaches a method for providing a supplemental flow of air/oxygen to a spontaneously breathing patient, the method comprising advancing a nasopharyngeal catheter through a patient's nostril until the distal tip of the catheter is located in the patient's distal nasopharynx or oropharynx. It should be noted that Brekke fails to specifically teach the step of supplying air/oxygen through the catheter at a flow rate of approximately 4 to 40 liters per minute. However, in performing this method of supplying air/oxygen there would be a flow rate that would fall within the range of 4- 40 liters.

21. As to claim 24, Brekke teaches essentially all of the limitations except providing a delivery tube extending beneath the patient's nostril for delivering the flow of air/oxygen, the delivery tube having a connector for attachment to the catheter; however, providing

Art Unit: 3761

such a delivery tube is known in the art. Brekke also fails to teach the step of cutting the proximal end of the catheter to a desired length so that the distal tip of the catheter will have a desired position relative to the patient's uvula. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to cut the proximal end of the catheter depending on the individual the catheter is to be inserted into.

22. As to claim 25, Brekke teaches essentially all of the limitations except for the initial step of selecting the length of the catheter by advancing a catheter through a patient's nostril until the distal tip of the catheter is visible through the patient's mouth below the patient's uvula. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include this initial step since the length of the catheter will differ from individual to individual.

23. As to claim 26, the method of supplying helium is known in the art.

24. Claims 5, 6, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brekke in view of Dali et al (3682171).

25. As to claim 5, Brekke teaches a nasopharyngeal catheter wherein the delivery tube further comprises two opposing ends with connectors for removable attachment to the gas source. Brekke fails to specifically teach a cap removably insertable into a connector that is not attached to the gas source. However, Dali et al. does teach a cap (plug) removably insertable into a connector that is not attached to the gas source. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include of the cap of Dali et al. in Brekke's catheter to cap the connector when it is not in use to prevent it from collecting dust and bacteria in the connector and causing contamination.

Art Unit: 3761

26. As to claim 6, Brekke fails to specifically teach a connector for removably attaching the proximal end of the nasal catheter to the delivery tube. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such a connector in Brekke so that if the pieces needed to be cleaned or replaced it would be easy to do so without having to discard the entire device.

27. As to claim 18, Brekke teaches a nasopharyngeal catheter wherein the delivery tube further comprises two opposing ends with connectors for removable attachment to the gas source. Brekke fails to specifically teach a cap removably insertable into a connector that is not attached to the gas source. However, Dali et al. does teach a cap (plug) removably insertable into a connector that is not attached to the gas source. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include of the cap of Dali et al. in Brekke's catheter to cap the connector when it is not in use to prevent it from collecting dust and bacteria in the connector and causing contamination.

28. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brekke in view of Spofford et al (5297546).

29. As to claim 7, Brekke teaches a nasal catheter having essentially all of the claimed limitations except for the catheter comprising a hydrophilic coating. Spofford et al teaches a catheter comprising a hydrophilic coating for limiting adhesion and subsequent build-up of mucous-type materials which would restrict the flow of oxygen through the catheter. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Brekke's catheter to have a hydrophilic coating for limiting adhesion and

Art Unit: 3761

subsequent build-up of mucous-type materials which would restrict the flow of oxygen through the catheter.

30. As to claim 19, Brekke teaches a nasal catheter having essentially all of the claimed limitations except for the catheter comprising a hydrophilic coating. Spofford et al teaches a catheter comprising a hydrophilic coating for limiting adhesion and subsequent build-up of mucous-type materials which would restrict the flow of oxygen through the catheter. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Brekke's catheter to have a hydrophilic coating for limiting adhesion and subsequent build-up of mucous-type materials which would restrict the flow of oxygen through the catheter.

31. Claims 9, 10, 21, 22, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brekke in view of Daniell et al (6050260).

32. As to claim 9, Brekke teaches essentially all of the claimed limitations except for a humidifier controlling the humidity of the gas delivered through the nasal catheter. However, Daniell does teach a humidifier for humidifying the gases delivered to the patient in order to prevent dehydration of the airways and nasal passages of the patient. Therefore, it would have been to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Brekke's device to include a humidifier for humidifying the gases delivered to the patient in order to prevent dehydration of the airways and nasal passages of the patient.

33. As to claim 10, the above combination teaches a nasopharyngeal catheter comprising a heater for controlling the temperature of the gas delivered through the catheter.

Art Unit: 3761

34. As to claim 21, Brekke teaches essentially all of the claimed limitations except for a humidifier controlling the humidity of the gas delivered through the nasal catheter.

However, Daniell does teach a humidifier for humidifying the gases delivered to the patient in order to prevent dehydration of the airways and nasal passages of the patient.

Therefore, it would have been to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Brekke's device to include a humidifier for humidifying the gases delivered to the patient in order to prevent dehydration of the airways and nasal passages of the patient.

35. As to claim 21, the above combination teaches a nasopharyngeal catheter comprising a heater for controlling the temperature of the gas delivered through the catheter.

36. As to claim 26, Brekke teaches essentially all of the limitations except for the method further comprising controlling the humidity of the air/oxygen supplied through the catheter. However, Daniell teaches the method of controlling the humidity of the gas delivered through the nasal catheter in order to prevent dehydration of the airways and nasal passages of the patient. Therefore, it would have been to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the method of Daniell for humidifying the gases delivered to the patient in order to prevent dehydration of the airways and nasal passages of the patient.

37. As to claim 27, the above combination teaches a method regulating the temperature of air/oxygen supplied through the catheter.

Art Unit: 3761

Conclusion

38. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mital B. Patel whose telephone number is 703-306-5444. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 - 4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 703-308-2702. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-306-4520 for regular communications and 703-306-4520 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.


Application/Control Number: 09/818,228

Page 11

Art Unit: 3761

mbp

January 29, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "J. L. White", written in a cursive style.

Page 11